



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

18
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,678	10/27/2000	Ryosuke Taniguchi	400906	5239
23548	7590	01/23/2002		
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD			EXAMINER	
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW			BUDD, MARK OSBORNE	
SUITE 300				
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
697678	Taniguchi et al
Examiner M. Budo	Group Art Unit 2834

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 Of the above claim(s) 22-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 Claim(s) 1-21 is/are allowed.
 Claim(s) is/are rejected.
 Claim(s) is/are objected to.
 Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4(1-16-01) Interview Summary, PTO-413
 Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims are vague and indefinite or inaccurate, in that they purport to define a magnetostriction oscillator mounting structure -- for mounting -- to an object ---" yet, structurally, nothing defining a support structure is included. A magnetostrictive oscillator is defined and an object with a hole is defined, but no separate mounting structure is defined. Is the hole in the object supposed to be the mounting structure? An empty hole does not seem an accurate description of a support structure.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (448) or (916).

Taniguchi (448) (Figs. 15, 17 and 26-36) and Taniguchi (916) (figs. 2-5, 7 and 8) teach a magnetostrictive oscillator of laminated design with excitation coils mounted within cavity. The ends of the magnetostrictive plates do not directly engage the cavity. In (916) one end contacts the cavity in (448) a coupling member is provided at each end of the magnetostrictive plates.

Serial Number: 09/697,678

Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

Since it has long been held that the omission of an element with the consequent loss of its function is within the skill expected of the routineer and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus to eliminate the element #29 of Tanguchi (916) or the coupling members e.g. #24, #25c Taniguchi (448) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Further cited of interest are Lamel, Spinnler and Drumheller.

Budd/ds

01/18/02

MARK J. BUDD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 217